EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

LAW OFFICES

## COHN AND MARKS

STANLEY S. NEUSTADT STANLEY B. COHEN RICHARD M. SCHMIDT, JR. JOEL H. LEVY ROBERT B. JACOB; ROY R. RUSSO RONALD A. SIEGEL LAWRENCE N. COHN RICHARD A. HELMICK

WAYNE COY, JR.

MARK L. PELESH
J. BRIAN DE BOICE
ALLAN ROBERT ADLER
CHARLES M. OLIVER

OF COUNSEL MARCUS COHN LEONARD H. MARKS

w

SUITE 600 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, N. W. WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036-1573

> TELECOPIER (202) 293-3860 TELECOPIER (202) 293-4827

SUSAN V. SACHS JOHN R. PRZYPYSZNY WILLIAM B. WILHELM, JR.\*

\*MEMBER PENNSYLVANIA BAR ONLY

March 23, 1995

DIRECT DIAL:

**EX PARTE** 

MH 23 1995

FEDERAL COMPACT CAPICAS COMMISSION

OFFICE SECRETARY

Mr. William F. Caton
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Suite 222
Washington, D.C. 20554
NOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Re:

CC Docket No. 94-54 Equal Access and Interconnection Obligations
Pertaining to Commercial Radio Services; GN Docket No. 93-252
Implementation of Sections 3(n) and 332 of the Communications Act

Dear Mr. Caton

On Wednesday, March 22, 1995, David Gusky and I, Joel H. Levy, met with Commissioner Susan Ness and her assistant Mary McManus to discuss the position of the National Wireless Resellers Association (formerly, the National Cellular Resellers Association) as reflected in the comments filed by NCRA in the above-referenced dockets. At the request of Commissioner Ness, I am also delivering to her by this letter, which is submitted herewith in duplicate, and attaching herewith a copy of a three page document dated January 24, 1994 issued by the NCRA and entitled, "Comparison of Cellular Service Prices in the 30 Largest Markets for Personal Safety and Convenience Use: January, 1988 - January, 1994."

The meeting also discussed the pending petition of the state of California in PR Docket No. 94-105 to retain regulatory authority over intra-state cellular service rates.

Very truly yours

Joel H. Levy

Enclosure

cc:

Commissioner Susan Ness w/enc.

Mary McManus, Esq. w/enc.

No. of Copies rec'd Ool



## COMPARISON OF CELLULAR SERVICE PRICES IN THE 30 LARGEST MARKETS FOR PERSONAL SAFETY AND CONVENIENCE USE: JANUARY, 1988 - JANUARY, 1994

January 24, 1994

## NATIONAL CELLULAR RESELLERS ASSOCIATION

## COMPARISON OF CELLULAR SERVICE PRICES FOR PERSONAL SAFETY AND CONVENIENCE USE: JANUARY, 1988 - JANUARY, 1984

The following table shows the best rates available in the 30 largest cellular markets for 30 minutes of monthly airtime in January, 1988 and January, 1994. NCRA believes this amount of airtime, divided into 20 minutes of usage during peak hours and 10 minutes of usage during off-peak hours, represents a reasonable calling pattern for individuals using a cellular phone chiefly for personal safety and convenience.

1 <b>966</b> \$ Diff	Market #	City	System	1968	1994	% Change	1994 \$ DIFF
<del></del>	1	New York	Α	<b>\$32</b> .50	\$39.99	23.0%	
\$3.50 \$0.00			В	<b>\$36</b> .00	\$45.65	26.8%	\$5.66
	2	Los Angeles	Α	\$45.00	\$45.00	0. <b>0%</b>	
			В	\$45.00	\$45.00	0. <b>0%</b>	\$0.00
\$1.00	3	Chicago	Α	<b>\$20</b> .00	<b>\$28</b> .35	41.8%	
			8	<b>\$2</b> 1.00	\$24.21	15.3%	\$4.14
\$1.00 \$0.00	4	Philadelphia	Α	<b>\$22</b> .95	\$34.95	52.3%	
			В	<b>\$23</b> .95	\$34.65	44.7%	<b>\$0</b> .30
	5	Detroit	Α	<b>\$16</b> .10	\$30.95	92.2%	
			В	<b>\$16</b> .10	<b>\$30</b> .95	92.2%	<b>\$0</b> .00
	6	Boston	Α	<b>\$22</b> .50	<b>\$33</b> .15	47.3%	
\$3.00			В	\$19.50	\$27.95	43.3%	\$5.20
\$0.00	7	San Francisco	Α	\$56.00	\$44.74	-20.1%	
			В	<b>\$56</b> .00	\$45.00	-19.6%	\$0.26
	8	Wash/Balt	Α	<b>\$22</b> .00	\$33.70	53.2%	
\$1.95			8	<b>\$23</b> .95	\$34.65	44.7%	<b>\$0</b> .95
	9	Dallas	Α	\$30.00	\$42.39	41.3%	
\$0.00			В	<b>\$30</b> .00	\$41.95	39.8%	\$0.44
<b>\$2</b> .75	10	Houston	A	<b>\$28</b> .95	\$31.99	10.5%	
			В	<b>\$26</b> .20	\$39.95	52.5%	\$7.96
\$0.00	11	St. Louis	Α	\$23.00	\$ <b>26</b> .95	17.2%	
			В	\$23.00	<b>\$29</b> .95	30.2%	\$3.00
\$4.50	12	Miami	Α	<b>\$30</b> .00	<b>\$52</b> .70	75.7%	
			В	\$34.50	\$49.55	43.6% <sup>-</sup>	<b>\$3</b> .15
	13 !	Pittsburgh	Α	\$14.20	\$39.99	181.6%	
18.75		•	В	\$32.95	\$38.05	15.5%	\$1.94

\$3.75	Averages		\$28.67	\$35.12	+32.4%	\$2.84
\$1.50	30 FUHANU	A B	\$23.50	\$33.50	42.6%	\$1.50
¥	30 Portland		\$25.00	\$35.00	40.0%	÷ = • = •
\$9.40	29 New Uneans	A B	<b>\$4</b> 2.90 <b>\$3</b> 3.50	<b>\$33</b> .95 <b>\$33</b> .95	-∠0.9 <del>%</del> 1. <b>3%</b>	<b>\$0.0</b> 0
	29 New Orleans	Λ			-20.9%	
\$3.00		В	\$15.00	\$24.95	66.3%	\$2.00
	28 Indianapolis	Α	<b>\$12.00</b>	<b>\$26</b> .95	124.6%	
\$6.60		В	<b>\$35</b> .55	\$40.25	13.2%	\$1.00
	26 Phoenix	Α	<b>\$28</b> .95	<b>\$39</b> .25	35.6%	
\$13.10	Lo Danaio	B	\$12.00	<b>\$23.35</b>	94.6%	\$4.30
	25 Buffalo	Α	<b>\$25</b> .10	<b>\$27</b> .65	10.2%	
\$0.00	•	В	<b>\$25</b> .50	\$35.85	40.6%	\$2.40
	24 Kansas City	Α	<b>\$25</b> .50	\$33.45	31.2%	
<b>\$0</b> .05		8	\$18.00	\$24.91	38.4%	\$6.04
	23 Cincinnati	Α	\$17.95	<b>\$30</b> .95	72.4%	
\$0.80		В	\$27.60	\$46.45	68.3%	\$11.50
40.75	22 Tampa	A	<b>\$26</b> .80	\$34.95	30.4%	
Φ1. <b>3</b> U		D	<b>#</b> ∉1.3U	<i>9∠1</i> .UU	29.0%	<b>₽</b> ∠. <b>8</b> 3
\$1.30	21 Milwaukee	A B	<b>\$20</b> .00 <b>\$21</b> .30	<b>\$29.9</b> 5 <b>\$27.</b> 00	49.7% 26.8%	\$2.95
Ψ11.70						<del></del>
\$11.75	20 Seattle	A B	<b>\$29</b> .50 <b>\$4</b> 1.25	<b>\$29.99</b> <b>\$29.</b> 95	1. <b>7%</b> -27.4%	\$0.04
	<b>00 0 a c 11 c c 1 c c c 11 c c c c c c c c c c</b>	<b>A</b>	400 50	<b>***</b>	. <b></b>	
\$6.05	13 Deliver	В	<b>\$35</b> .55	\$ <b>36</b> .95	3.9%	\$0.36
	19 Denver	Α	<b>\$29</b> .50	\$ <b>36</b> .59	24.0%	
\$8.35	.c can blogo	В	<b>\$36</b> .65	\$3 <b>8</b> .00	3.7%	\$1.45
	18 San Diego	Α	\$45.00	<b>\$36.5</b> 5	-18.8%	
\$0.00		В	<b>\$40</b> .00	\$41.75	4.4%	\$8.05
	17 Atlanta	Α	\$40.00	\$33.70	-15.7%	
\$0.05		В	<b>\$28</b> .00	<b>\$29</b> .75	6. <b>3%</b>	\$1.20
	16 Cleveland	Α	<b>\$27</b> .95	\$30.95	10.7%	
\$6.60		В	<b>\$35</b> .55	\$35.85	0. <b>8</b> %	\$3.61
-	15 Minneapolis	-A ·	-	\$32.24	11.4%	co e4

The monthly airtime charges contained in this report were calculated by using data obtained from Information Enterprises and the customer service departments of the licensed carriers in each market listed above. The monthly airtime charges reflect the best rates available on service contracts not exceeding one year in length.